

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/621,131	07/16/2003	William Paul Schmidt	ML 0166 PUS	1972	
7590 04/11/2006			EXAM	INER	
Steven W. Hays			ROBINSON, MARK A		
Suite 250 28333 Telegrap	h Road		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Southfield, MI 48034			2872	-	
<u>.</u>		•,	DATE MAII ED: 04/11/2006	4	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	on No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/621,13	10/621,131		SCHMIDT, WILLIAM PAUL	
		Examiner		Art Unit		
		Mark A. R	obinson	2872	(Arry)	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication	n appears on the	cover sheet with	the correspondence a	ddress	
A SH WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILIN nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicatio o period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory p re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by reply received by the Office later than three months after the ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	IG DATE OF THE FR 1.136(a). In no even on. period will apply and wistatute, cause the apply	HIS COMMUNIC ent, however, may a rep Il expire SIX (6) MONT lication to become ABA	ATION. bly be timely filed HS from the mailing date of this NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status						
1)⊠ 2a)⊠ 3)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is FINAL . 2b) Since this application is in condition for al closed in accordance with the practice un	This action is n lowance except	on-final. for formal matte		ne merits is	
Dispositi	ion of Claims		•			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are pending in the applicated. 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>4,5 and 8-16</u> is/are claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-3,6 and 7</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction as	are withdrawn fr		n.		
Applicati	ion Papers					
10)	The specification is objected to by the Exa The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection t Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the c The oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) o the drawing(s) borrection is require	be held in abeyand ed if the drawing(s	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). i) is objected to. See 37 (
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119			·		
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fo All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Beautheattened detailed Office action for	ments have bee ments have bee priority docume ureau (PCT Rul	n received. n received in Ap ents have been r e 17.2(a)).	plication No eceived in this Nationa	al Stage	
2) Notice 3) Information	et(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94 mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/Ser No(s)/Mail Date		Paper No(s)	ummary (PTO-413) /Mail Date formal Patent Application (P `	TO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 10/621,131

Art Unit: 2872

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-3,6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Englander (US 6636822) in view of either Foster (US 2877686) or Bateman (US 3610736).

Englander discloses a crossover or crossview mirror assembly for mounting on a front surface of a vehicle having a cab (see fig. 3), the mirror assembly meeting visual requirements set forth in FMVSS 111 (see col. 1) and comprising an arcuate mirror (mirror 22 is clearly arcuate due to the shown distortion) with frame and mounting support (clearly shown in fig. 3) coupled to the front of the vehicle.

Englander does not disclose a servomotor actuator controlled by an electronic controller assembly for swiveling the mirror along an x-axis about a center point to move the

mirror clockwise or counterclockwise about the center point. However, these features are disclosed by both Foster (as discussed previously) and Bateman. With respect to Foster, note motor(M1, M2) and toggle-switch type controller (col. 3) which swivel the mirror along an x-axis about a tubular region center point (e.g. 19) along a horizontal plane (see fig. 3). With respect to Bateman, note motor(30) and toggle-switch type controller(39) which swivel the mirror along an x-axis about a tubular region center point (e.g. 24,25,etc.) along a horizontal plane. Note with respect to claims 6 and 7 that since the swiveling of Foster's and Bateman's mirrors is limited, a center position may be defined midway between the clockwise-most and counterclockwise-most limits. Note also that Foster shows the swiveling to be not greater than approximately 45 degrees (fig. 3) and that Bateman's limiting structure (33,34) limits swiveling to less than this value. It would have been obvious to the ordinarily skilled artisan at the time of invention to include the actuator and controller assembly of either Foster or Bateman with Englander's mirror since motorized adjustment of the mirror is more convenient and quicker than manual adjustment.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 1/30/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant has argued that there is no motivation to combine Englander with either Foster or Bateman since Englander's invention is not concerned specifically with a crossview or crossover mirror or an electronically controlled version of the same. Further, applicant argued that since Englander is concerned with regulatory compliance of vehicle mirrors, there is no motivation in Englander to use the mirror control systems of either Foster or Bateman.

In response, the examiner notes that while Englander is primarily concerned with testing and compliance of vehicle mirrors, Englander also discloses a crossview or crossover mirror supported by a vehicle (bus) as clearly shown in fig. 3. The drawings are to be evaluated for what they reasonably disclose or suggest to the ordinarily skilled artisan whether or not what is shown is either intended or explained in the specification. See MPEP 2125. Therefore, the claimed mirror and support are met by Englander as set forth in the rejection, regardless of whether or not these elements are of primary concern to Englander.

Concerning motivation, it should be noted that there is no requirement that motivation to combine the teachings of references be found in the primary reference. In this case, the rejection sets forth a motivation for the combination of teachings, and this motivation has not been specifically traversed by applicant. Thus, it is still seen that using the electronic actuator/controller of either Foster or Bateman provides the benefits cited in the rejection.

Conclusion

4. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Robinson whose telephone number is (571) 272-2319.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Drew Dunn, can be reached at (571) 272-2312. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2800.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MR

4/6/06

MARK A. HOBINSON PRIMARY EXAMINER